

1 CHAD A. READLER  
2 Acting Assistant Attorney General  
3 BRETT A. SHUMATE  
4 Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
5 JOHN R. GRIFFITHS  
6 Director, Federal Programs Branch  
7 JOSHUA E. GARDNER  
8 CARLOTTA P. WELLS  
9 Assistant Directors, Federal Programs Branch  
10 KATE BAILEY  
11 GARRETT COYLE  
12 STEPHEN EHRLICH  
13 CAROL FEDERIGHI  
14 DANIEL HALAINEN  
15 MARTIN TOMLINSON  
16 Trial Attorneys  
17 United States Department of Justice  
18 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
19 P.O. Box 883  
20 Washington, DC 20044  
21 Tel.: (202) 514-1903  
22 Email: carol.federighi@usdoj.gov  
23  
24 Attorneys for Defendants

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,

Civil Action No. 3:18-cv-01865-RS

Plaintiffs,

**JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF FED.  
R. EVID. 502(d) ORDER**

v.

WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., *et al.*,

Dept: 3  
Judge: The Honorable Richard G. Seeborg  
Trial Date: January 7, 2019  
Action Filed: March 26, 2018

Defendants.

The parties respectfully move the Court, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d), to enter the attached order governing the inadvertent production of documents that may be privileged or protected. In support of this motion, the parties state as follows:

1       1. Plaintiffs have served discovery requests that seek documents or other information  
2 that may be privileged or protected from disclosure. In addition, the parties have previously agreed  
3 to participate in the discovery already underway in *State of New York v. U.S. Department of Commerce*,  
4 1:18-cv-02921, and *New York Immigration Coalition v. U.S. Department of Commerce*, 1:18-cv-05025,  
5 matters before Judge Furman of the Southern District of New York that involve nearly identical  
6 claims to those at issue in this matter, including receiving documents and discovery responses  
7 served in those cases.

9       2. To guard against the risk of inadvertent waiver of any applicable privileges or  
10 protections, the parties have conferred and agreed on a procedure to assert such claims after  
11 production pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 502(d).

12      3. Accordingly, the parties respectfully request that the Court enter the attached  
13 proposed order.

14 Dated: September 7, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 XAVIER BECERRA  
2 Attorney General of California  
3 MARK R. BECKINGTON  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
GABRIELLE D. BOUTIN  
Deputy Attorney General

5 /s/ R. Matthew Wise  
R. MATTHEW WISE  
6 Deputy Attorney General

7 *Attorneys for Plaintiff State of California, by and*  
*through Attorney General Xavier Becerra*

9 /s/ Margaret L. Carter  
MARGARET L. CARTER, SBN 220637  
10 DANIEL R. SUVOR  
O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP  
11 400 S. Hope Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: (213) 430-8000  
13 Fax: (213) 430-6407  
Email: dsuvor@omm.com

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff County of Los Angeles*

16 MIKE FEUER  
City Attorney for the City of Los Angeles

18 /s/ Valerie Flores  
VALERIE FLORES, SBN 138572  
Managing Senior Assistant City Attorney  
200 North Main Street, 7th Floor, MS 140  
21 Los Angeles, CA 90012  
Telephone: (213) 978-8130  
Fax: (213) 978-8222  
Email: Valerie.Flores@lacity.org

22 HARVEY LEVINE  
23 City Attorney for the City of Fremont

24 /s/ Harvey Levine  
SBN 61880  
3300 Capitol Ave.  
Fremont, CA 94538  
Telephone: (510) 284-4030  
26 Fax: (510) 284-4031  
Email: hlevine@fremont.gov

CHAD A. READLER  
Acting Assistant Attorney General

BRETT A. SHUMATE  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

JOHN R. GRIFFITHS  
Director, Federal Programs Branch

CARLOTTA P. WELLS  
JOSHUA E. GARDNER  
Assistant Branch Directors

5 /s/ Carol Federighi  
KATE BAILEY  
GARRETT COYLE  
STEPHEN EHRLICH  
CAROL FEDERIGHI  
DANIEL HALAINEN  
MARTIN TOMLINSON  
Trial Attorneys  
United States Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20530  
Tel.: (202) 514-1903  
Email: [carol.federighi@usdoj.gov](mailto:carol.federighi@usdoj.gov)

Attorneys for Defendants

1 CHARLES PARKIN  
2 City Attorney for the City of Long Beach

3 /s/ Michael J. Mais  
4 MICHAEL K. MAIS, SBN 90444  
5 Assistant City Attorney  
6 333 W. Ocean Blvd., 11th Floor  
7 Long Beach CA, 90802  
8 Telephone: (562) 570-2200  
9 Fax: (562) 436-1579  
10 Email: Michael.Mais@longbeach.gov

11 BARBARA J. PARKER  
12 City Attorney for the City of Oakland

13 /s/ Erin Bernstein  
14 MARIA BEE  
15 Special Counsel  
16 ERIN BERNSTEIN, SBN 231539  
17 Supervising Deputy City Attorney  
18 MALIA MCPHERSON  
19 Attorney  
20 City Hall, 6th Floor  
21 1 Frank Ogawa Plaza  
22 Oakland, California 94612  
23 Telephone: (510) 238-3601  
24 Fax: (510) 238-6500  
25 Email: ebernstein@oaklandcityattorney.org

26 JOHN LUEBBERKE  
27 City Attorney for the City of Stockton

28 /s/ John Luebberke  
1 SBN 164893  
2 425 N. El Dorado Street, 2nd Floor  
3 Stockton, CA 95202  
4 Telephone: (209) 937-8333  
5 Fax: (209) 937-8898  
6 Email: John.Luebberke@stocktonca.gov

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

16 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, *et al.*,

Civil Action No. 3:18-cv-01865-RS

17 Plaintiffs,

[PROPOSED] FED. R. EVID. 502(d)  
18 ORDER

v.

19 WILBUR L. ROSS, JR., *et al.*,

Dept: 3  
20 Judge: The Honorable Richard G. Seeborg  
Defendants. Trial Date: January 7, 2019  
21 Action Filed: March 26, 2018

22

23 Upon consideration of the parties' joint motion pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence  
24 502(d) for entry of an order governing the inadvertent production of documents that may be  
25 privileged or protected, it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:  
26  
27  
28

1       **I. NO WAIVER BY DISCLOSURE**

2           1. The production of a document, or part of a document, shall not constitute a waiver  
3 of any privilege or protection as to any portion of that document, or as to any undisclosed  
4 privileged or protected communications or information concerning the same subject matter, in this  
5 or in any other proceeding. This Order applies to the attorney-client privilege, work-product  
6 protections, and all other protections afforded by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b) and  
7 governmental privileges. Nothing in this Order shall constitute an admission that any document  
8 disclosed in this litigation is subject to any of the foregoing privileges or protections, or that any  
9 party is entitled to raise or assert such privileges. Additionally, nothing in this Order shall prohibit  
10 parties from withholding from production any document covered by any applicable privilege or  
11 other protection.

12           2. This Order shall displace the provisions of Fed. R. Evid. 502(b)(1) and (2). That is,  
13 the disclosure of privileged or protected information, as described above, in this litigation shall not  
14 constitute a subject-matter waiver of the privilege or protection in this or any other federal or state  
15 proceeding, regardless of the standard of care or specific steps taken to prevent disclosure.  
16 However, nothing in this Order shall limit a party's right to conduct a pre-production review of  
17 documents as it deems appropriate.

18       **II. DEFINITIONS**

19           1. "Document," as used herein, includes all items listed in Fed. R. Civ. P. 34(a)(1)(A)  
20 and (B).

21           2. "Documents Produced," as used herein, includes all documents made available for  
22 review or produced in any manner during this litigation.

3. "Party," as used herein, shall be construed to encompass both parties and nonparties that produce documents pursuant to a subpoena issued under Fed. R. Civ. P. 45, including the U.S. Department of Justice.

### III. PROCEDURES

The procedures applicable to a claim of privilege with respect to a document produced after August 28, 2018 and the resolution thereof shall be as follows:

1. Nothing in this Order is intended to shift the burden to identify privileged and protected documents from the producing party to the receiving party.

2. If the producing party determines that a document produced, or part thereof, is subject to a privilege or privileges, the producing party shall promptly give the receiving party notice of the claim of privilege (“privilege notice”).

3. The privilege notice must contain information sufficient to identify the document including, if applicable, a Bates number as well as an identification of the privilege asserted and its basis.

4. If the producing party promptly sends the receiving party a privilege notice, the receiving party shall follow the procedures set forth in Rule 26(b)(5)(B).

**SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

---

HON. RICHARD SEEBORG  
United States District Judge